



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/545,691	04/07/2000	Barrie Gilbert	1482-132	2100

7590 09/26/2002

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM P C
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205

EXAMINER

SOBUTKA, PHILIP

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2683

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



RECEIVED

2002 DEC - 2 PM 2:16

BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

EXH

6
PAGE 1 OF 6



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 16

Application Number: 09/545,691
Filing Date: April 07, 2000
Appellant(s): GILBERT, BARRIE

MAILED

Joseph Makuch
For Appellant

SEP 26 2002
Technology Center 2600

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed September 24, 2002.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

EXH *6*
PAGE 2 OF 6

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is incorrect.

The amendment after final rejection filed on 2-27-2002 has been entered.

(5) Summary of Invention

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Issues

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) Grouping of Claims

The rejection of claims 15 stand or fall together because appellant's brief does not include a statement that this grouping of claims does not stand or fall together and reasons in support thereof. See 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7).

(8) ClaimsAppealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

5,789,799

Voinigescu et al

08-1998

5,307,512

Mitzlaff

04-1994

(10) *Grounds of Rejection*

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voinigescu et al (US 5,789,799) in view of Mitzlaff (US 5,307,512).

Consider claim 15. Voinigescu teaches an amplifier cell comprising first and second input terminals (Voinigescu, fig 9, RF & LO), first and second output terminals (Voinigescu, fig 9, IF), first input stage coupled to the first and second output terminals (Voinigescu, fig 9, Q1,Q2) and arranged to drive the first and second output terminals responsive to a first input signal received at the first input terminal; and a second input stage coupled to the first and second output terminals and arranged to drive the first and second output terminals responsive to a second input signals received at the second input terminal (Voinigescu, fig 9, Q3,Q6). Voinigescu lacks a teaching of the amplifier stages being class AB. Mitzlaff teaches that class AB operation has higher efficiency when constant envelope modulation schemes such as FM are employed (col 2, lines 62-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Voinigescu to use AB stages for higher efficiency when in FM operation.

(11) Response to Argument

Note that while the previous action contained a typographical error in that only one side of the mixer arrangement was mentioned, clearly the arrangement requires Q3 and Q6 to be coupled to the LO, and Q1 and Q2 to be coupled to the RF input. Note that the mixer arrangement as a whole was being cited, as the appellant appeared to realize when he presumed that the cited output included both IF+ and IF-, on page 3, in the last paragraph of appellants brief.

In response to appellants argument's note that while the RF input (Q1, Q2) is not directly coupled to the output terminals, clearly the RF input is driving the output of a mixer arrangement which mixes RF and LO to produce the IF. That is, the RF drives the input stage, which includes Q1 and Q2, while the LO drives the mixer stage, the input and mixer core together produce the two IF outputs at IF+ and IF-.

As to appellant's arguments regarding Voinigescu, note that while Voinigescu may indicate other arrangements for FM operation, clearly Voinigescu teaches the advantage being produced by AB operation, which is the teaching relied upon in the rejection.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,




Philip Sobutka
September 25, 2002

Conferees
William Trost

WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Lee Nguyen

Lee Nguyen
Primary Examiner



MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM P C
1030 SW MORRISON STREET
PORTLAND, OR 97205